

REMARKS

Claims 33-54 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-32 have been previously cancelled and claims 33-44 have been previously withdrawn from consideration. Claims 53 and 54 are new. New independent claim 53 is somewhat similar in scope to independent claim 52 but includes additional limitations relating to the restrictions on crew members that are considered by the "crew engine". New dependent claim 54 recites the "fleet engine" limitation.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The undersigned wishes to express his appreciate to the Examiner for courtesy of the telephone interview on June 9th regarding the present application. The cited references and pending §103 rejection were briefly discussed along with whether the additional language included in the independent claims in the response filed June 2, 2010 would be sufficient to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101. On the §101 rejection the Examiner indicated that the language included in the June 2nd response would not likely be sufficient to overcome the §101 rejection. The undersigned proposed adding additional language to specifically call out a "*processing subsystem to implement*" two or more of the crew engine, the passenger engine and the fleet engine. The Examiner gave a preliminary indication that this language would likely suffice to overcome the §101 rejection, but that further consideration of this issue would be required. With regard to the pending rejection under §103, no agreement was reached.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

New independent claim 53 includes limitations expressly calling out specific types of crew constraint information that the crew engine generates, which may then be used by the integration engine in determining potential rescheduling solutions. Support for these limitations may be found on page 12 of the application. It will be noted that Yu et al., (U.S. 6,314,361) was cited as disclosing considerations given to "service crews" in the Yu et al. system. In the previous response the undersigned noted that only one generally vague statement was made concerning the "crew" considerations, but that comment in Yu et al. did not go so far as to disclose or suggest the limitations now present in independent claim 53. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 53 is patentable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 14, 2010

By: Mark D. Elchuk
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
MDE/al/chs
15531154.1